

COUNCIL OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

Minutes of the meeting held on May 8, 1981

Present: D. Taddeo Chairman, J. Chaikelson, M. Cohen, M. Singer, J. Princz, M. Armstrong (afternoon), C. Campbell (afternoon), J. Doyle, C. Kalman, C. Langford, J. Lightstone, J. Macaluso, H. Proppe, D. McDougall, S. McEvenue, J. Ryan, D. Otchere, E. Pechter, B. Petrie (afternoon), E. Raudsepp, L. Sanders, S. Sheinberg, H. Shulman, M. Shames, B. Slack, J. Tascone, G. Trudel, A. Moralejo (afternoon), G. Murray.

Absent with Regrets: R. Tekel

Guests: M. Squires (Simone de Beauvoir Institute).

Morning Session

1. The Chairman called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

No formal approval of the agenda was made.

3. Special Task Force Report on Curriculum

- The Chairman gave a brief outline of what had been reviewed and approved to-date in the Special Task Force Report on Curriculum saying that a consensus had been arrived at of what the principles should state, but as yet the written version had not been put before Council, but that that would be done when the whole document had been exhausted. Dean Taddeo suggested that in continuing the review of the document that, rather than try to edit as a group, comments be restricted to the principle and to the extent to which councillors would want that principle changed. Following the completion of the review of the document Dean Taddeo said Council will be reconvened to look at the final document which will reflect the changes proposed, amended and adopted, and to vote on that document as a whole.

Concern was expressed over the absence of student members and the fact that they would not likely be present at the next meeting; was it fair to vote on the document in their absence.

It was suggested that the question be raised at the Steering Committee meeting which was to take place at noon.

Prof. Kalman reported the reaction of his Department to the reduction in the number of credits for an honours programme to sixty.

81-8-1

Prof. Langford moved to change the final sentence under III (1) d, p. 7 to "Exceptions should be made where established professional standards require it."

Following discussion on the amendment Dean Cohen asked that it be changed

to "Exceptions may be made for programmes where external considerations require it."

Prof. Langford was in agreement and withdrew his amendment.

Attention was turned to the first section of item d, page 6.

- 81-8-2 It was moved and seconded (Kalman/Trudel) to strike item d, page 6 ending with "to this end" page 7.

It was understood through the discussion that followed that the editors would replace it with something appropriate.

Dean Taddeo asked for a vote on the amendment.

Dr. Trudel noted there was not a quorum present and questioned the legality of any motions that might be adopted.

Prof. Scheinberg suggested that since Council would reconvene in two weeks to vote on the final document that anything done at this meeting was really a matter of reference for the editorial changes.

- 81-8-3 Prof. Trudel moved that anything voted on at this meeting is put forth clearly in the document as a consensus of the members in attendance, and not an official vote.

The Chairman repeated that the only legal document that will be adopted will be the one that Council approves in its final written form.

It was asked if there would be an opportunity at that occasion for clause by clause analysis.

Dean Chaikelson thought that the answer to that would have to be "no" and went on to say that there could be amendments to clauses in the document brought forward, but that a clause by clause review should not take place.

There were objections to carrying on the meeting when quorum had been challenged.

- 81-8-4 It was moved and seconded (Doyle/Scheinberg) without prejudice to the question of quorum to move into the committee of the whole.

Vote: CARRIED

The discussion continued.

Dean Taddeo asked if Council as a group was agreeable to continue deliberating on the document, so that at the next meeting the final document can be considered and voted on if there is a quorum at that time.

Dr. Trudel said he would agree only if the quorum for that meeting was established at 29 not 22. Given the already established regulation of 22 as quorum for May, Dr. Trudel asked for a quorum count. There wasn't a quorum present.

A 10-minute break in the meeting was called while the secretary left the meeting to attempt to raise a quorum.

A quorum was achieved and the meeting proceeded.

The question was called on the amendment and was CARRIED.

Recommendation 3.1

- 81-8-5 It was moved and seconded (McEvenue/Slack) that Council adopt III (1) (a) to (e), as amended, as regulations for the structure of programmes and course offerings. Vote: CARRIED

Recommendation 3.2

- 81-8-6 It was moved and seconded (Chaikelson/Singer) to amend Recommendation 3.2 (1) to "That while every student in a degree programme must complete an Honours, Specialization or Major, within every block of 30 credits a student will normally take no more than 24 credits from one discipline or department. In order to receive the degree a student must complete a minimum of 18 credits outside the discipline or department."
- 81-8-7 It was moved and seconded (Cohen/Singer) to split the amendment in order to vote on each section separately. Vote: CARRIED

The question was called on the first section of the amendment and was CARRIED.

There was some discussion on the meaning of the last phrase "discipline or department" which had been changed earlier from "area of specialization." Dean Chaikelson clarified the intent by saying that courses taken in another department as a requirement in a programme could not count towards the 18 credits "outside".

The question was called, a vote was taken on calling the question and was DEFEATED.

- 81-8-8 It was moved and seconded (Scheinberg/Trudel) to change the 18 credits to 6 credits.

Dean Chaikelson pointed out that the sub-amendment was inconsistent with what had been approved and could not be accepted.

- 81-8-9 It was moved and seconded (Cohen/Pechter) that the requirement of 18 credits outside be changed to 24. Vote: CARRIED
11/10/2

A re-count was requested which resulted in an increase in the votes in favour (12/11/1)

The question was called on approval of the amendment as modified and was CARRIED.
(14/1/8)

81-8-10 It was moved and seconded (Chaikelson/Scheinberg) to insert a new (ii) between the existing (i) and (ii).- Students proceeding to a degree in Arts and Science must take at least 18 credits in every block of 30 credits from Arts and Science. Vote: CARRIED

81-8-11 It was moved and seconded (Cohen/Slack) to approve Recommendation 3.2 (iii). Vote: CARRIED

Recommendation 3.3

81-8-12 It was moved and seconded (Cohen/McEvenue) to approve Recommendation 3.3. Vote: CARRIED

81-8-13 It was moved and seconded (Cohen/Scheinberg) to take a recess until 1:00 p.m. Vote: CARRIED

AFTERNOON SESSION

Recommendation 3.4

81-8-14 It was moved and seconded (Kalman/Macaluso) to amend Recommendation 3.4 to remove reference to Recommendation 3.2 (iii) and 3.3. and to change the statement to "That Faculty Council establish a study group to deal with the problem of effective and compulsory academic counselling."

Miss Crowe then read the recommendations in the document entitled Proposed Mandate for the Committee to Study Academic Advising which had been distributed at the meeting of January 9, 1981.

Following the reading Dean Taddeo interpreted the meaning to be that there were eight specific points which amongst others, should be looked at. Council was in agreement with his view.

Prof. Kalman agreed to change his amendment to retain the words "in order to study Recommendations 3.2 (iii) and 3.3" on the condition that added to that would be the consideration of the recommendations contained in the Proposal on Academic Advising submitted by the student members of Council. (ASFC 81-1-D6).

The question was called on the amendment and was CARRIED.

81-8-15 It was moved and seconded (Crowe/Murray) to amend the second sentence of Recommendation 3.4 in such a way as to insure that at least one faculty member and one student from each Division would be included. Vote: CARRIED

81-8-16 It was moved and seconded (Kalman/Scheinberg) that Steering Committee present a recommendation on the composition of the committee at the next meeting of Council in order to have the work started immediately. Vote: CARRIED

IV THE CURRICULAR PROCESS

Recommendation 4.1

- 81-8-17 It was moved and seconded (Murray/Ryan) to approve Recommendation 4.1
Vote: CARRIED

Recommendation 4.2

- 81-8-18 It was moved and seconded (Chaikelson/McEvenue) to approve Recommendation 4.2.
Vote: CARRIED

Recommendation 4.3

- 81-8-19 It was moved and seconded (Scheinberg/Trudel) to approve Recommendation 4.3.
Vote: CARRIED

Recommendation 4.4

- 81-8-20 It was moved and seconded (Lightstone/Shames) to amend the first sentence to read "on a five-year cycle" in place of a three-year cycle.
Vote: CARRIED

- 81-8-21 It was moved and seconded (Lightstone/Pechter) to amend the second sentence to read "Such appraisals shall be made by an ad hoc committee appointed by the Arts and Science Faculty Council and will normally include, as Chairman, a representative of the Curriculum Committee, an external examiner from within the discipline chosen by Faculty Council from a list of experts recommended by the discipline (as for Graduate Studies appraisals), and an ex-officio representative from the department in question.
Vote: DEFEATED
5/9/12

- 81-8-22 It was moved and seconded (Cohen/Otchere) to propose a sub-amendment to change the inclusion of an external examiner on the committee to "and may include an external examiner" and to remove the word normally.
Vote: CARRIED

- 81-8-23 It was moved and seconded (Scheinberg/Shames) to amend the last sentence of Recommendation 4.4 to "Major curricular submissions may not normally be made at intervals of less than three years."
Vote: CARRIED

It was agreed that a definition of "Major" and "Minor" should be included in the document.

- 81-8-24 It was moved and seconded (Chaikelson/Cohen) that within three years of approval of the report all departments and units will be appraised. The Divisional Deans and Provost will draw up a schedule that encompasses the first three-year, and the first five-year cycle, which will incorporate, in the first round, the current schedule of Division IV appraisals as required by Senate; the schedule to be submitted to Council for approval.
Vote: CARRIED

It was agreed that the statement should become Recommendation 4.6.

Recommendation 4.5

81-8-25 It was moved and seconded (Scheinberg/McEvenue) to accept Recommendation 4.5 as presented. Vote: CARRIED

81-8-26 It was moved and seconded (Pechter/Murray) to add to Recommendation 4.5 "In questions such as determining the major or minor status of changes proposed, and determining the capacity of the proposed change to fulfill the principles and regulations specified in the Report, the Curriculum Committee should be as flexible as possible. In cases where a disagreement exists between the Curriculum Committee and any constituency submitting proposals, the burden of establishing its case should be on the Curriculum Committee."

Prof. McEvenue proposed that the motion be split. It was so agreed.

The question was called on the first section of the motion and was CARRIED.

The question was called on the second part of the motion and was DEFEATED (8/13/4).

* * * * *

Notice of Motion

81-8-27 It was moved by Professor Lightstone to look into the process by which Curriculum proposals move through the various bureaucratic levels with an eye to the possibility of seeing if the process might not be simplified.

Dean Chaikelson pointed out that there was a recommendation at the time of the merger of Arts and Science that Major and Minor changes go different routes than they now go and she suggested that Council recommend to Senate that the whole curriculum submission process be reviewed in order to simplify it.

Prof. McEvenue asked if Dean Chaikelson's suggestion could be taken as a notice of motion to be presented at the next meeting. It was so agreed.

V. SPECIAL RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommendation 5.1

81-8-28 It was moved and seconded (Singer/Doyle) to delete recommendation 5.1 dealing with the establishment of a College of Arts and Science, without prejudice.

Provost Singer stressed that it should be clearly understood that the elimination of Recommendation 5.1 was not a value judgment on the question of whether we should or should not have core curriculum consideration in some other way or maybe through this College concept, but not in the ^{even} normal way.

normal - (way) even then the

- 81-8-29 Prof. Ryan said that he intended to recommend that the Arts and Science Faculty Council strike a committee to investigate precisely the question of core curriculum, the option of cores, the philosophies involved in cores, and to report back their recommendation in terms of their findings in the course of the next year.

The Chairman suggested that he present his motion after the motion on 5.1 had been voted on.

The question was called on the motion to delete 5.1 and was CARRIED.
21/1/1

Prof. Ryan repeated his motion which was seconded by Prof. Scheinberg.

Provost Singer said that he wanted to amend the motion to insert "additional" before core curriculum and asked to have the motion repeated.

Dean Chaikelson suggested that the vote take place on the intent of the motion and that it be left to the editors to write the statement. She summarized the intent of the motion to "that a committee of Council be established to investigate additional core curriculum in the Faculty of Arts and Science and to report back to Council in the course of the next year.

The question was called on the motion and was CARRIED.
(21/1/2)

Recommendation 5.2

- 81-8-30 It was moved and seconded (Scheinberg/McEvenue) to approve Recommendation 5.2 as presented. Vote: CARRIED

Recommendation 5.3

- 81-8-31 It was moved and seconded (Scheinberg/McEvenue) to approve Recommendation 5.3 as presented. Vote: CARRIED

Prof. Trudel asked if Mr. Potvin had been consulted. The question was left unanswered.

3. Next Meeting

May 15, 1981

4. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m. (Otchere/Shames).